

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Billy Lee Lisenby,)	C/A No. 5:14-cv-01830-DCN-KDW
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Warden Cecilia Reynolds, Lt. Robert)	
Miller, Grievance Clerk P. Hough, James)	
S. Sligh, Jr., Major D. Seward, A. Sellers,)	
DHO, Counsel Substitute Armstrong,)	
and Mr. Padula)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 27, 2015, Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 62. Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of such motions and of the need for him to file adequate responses. ECF No. 63. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the Defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending this case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the Motion and wishes to abandon this action against these Defendants. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment by **May 22, 2015**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action

will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



April 22, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge